REMARKS

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed November 2, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 13, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Charles P. Pfleeger, "Security in Computing," ISBN 013374866, 1996 (Pfleeger). The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 12-14, 21, 24, 26, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 43, and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,261 (Wiegel). The Examiner rejected claims 9-11, 27, 33, 35, 42, and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel in view of Official Notice. The Examiner indicated that a Double Patenting Rejection of claims 1-28 and 31-45 over claims in U.S. Patent Application No. 09/728,558 will be invalidated upon U.S. Patent Application No. 09/728,558 going abandoned.

2. Pending Claims

Presently pending in this application are claims 1-21, 24, 26-28, 30-38 and 42-49, of which claims 1, 13, 37, and 38 are independent.

3. Response to Examiner's Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 13, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pfleeger. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 12-14, 21, 24, 26, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 43, and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wiegel. Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejections of pending claims 1-8, 12-14, 21, 24, 26, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 43, and 46-49, because neither Pfleeger nor Wiegel discloses or suggests each and every element as recited in any of these claims.

In particular, neither Pfleeger nor Wiegel discloses or suggests (i) *providing* at least a portion of the access-control logic to an interconnection system *in response to an attempted*

inter-node communication involving the at least one service component, as recited in claim 1, or (ii) *providing* at least a portion of the access-control logic to an interconnection system *in response to an attempted inter-node communication* between service components, as recited in claim 13, or (iii) *providing* to the interconnection system, *in response to an attempted inter-node communication* between the application components, at least a portion of access-control rules that define allowed communication between the application components, as recited in claim 37, or (iv) a session manager communicatively linked with the interconnection system, wherein the logic is located, at least in part, in the session manager, and wherein the session manager *provides* at least a portion of the logic to the interconnection system *in response to the attempted inter-node communication*, as recited in claim 38. (Emphasis added).

a.   **Pfleeger Reference**

In rejecting claims 1, 13, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner stated "The newly introduced limitation: "providing at least a portion of the access-control logic to the interconnection system in response to an attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component" is inherent." Applicant submits that Pfleeger does not teach or suggest this limitation. On the contrary, at best, in discussing screening routers, Pfleeger recites "A router has the rather simple task of receiving each packet, consulting stored routing tables, and passing the packet to one of several physical ports that will get the packet to its destination." Applicant submits that this teaching in Pfleeger, as well as the rest of Pfleeger, does not teach or suggest *providing* at least a portion of the access-control logic to the interconnection system *in response to an attempted inter-node communication* involving the at least one service component. (Emphasis added).

- 3 -

Moreover, "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic <u>necessarily</u> flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." (M.P.E.P. §2112, quoting Ex Parte Levy, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464, (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)). Although the Examiner explained the main purpose of firewalls is to allow or block inter-node communications and inter-node communications inherently involve multiple service components, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not provided the required basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the Examiner's position that *"providing* at least a portion of the access-control logic to the interconnection system *in response to an attempted inter-node communication* involving the at least one service component" necessarily flows from the teachings of Pfleeger. (Emphasis added).

Because Pfleeger does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 13, and 37, Pfleeger fails to anticipate claims 1, 13, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Further, claims 2-12, 14-21, 24, 26-28, 30-36, and 46-48 depend from either of claims 1, 13, or 37, and thus are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

b.   **Weigel Reference**

In rejecting claims 1, 13, and 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the Examiner indicated that Weigel's teaching reads on providing to the interconnection system, in response to an attempted inter-node communication between application components, at least a portion of access-control rules that define allowed communication between the application components. Applicant submits that Pfleeger does not teach or suggest this limitation. On the contrary, at best, Weigel teaches that to establish a security policy applicable to a network or one of its nodes, the user can drag network security policies and drop them onto each icon in the network tree. (See, e.g., Col.

- 4 -

15, lines 38-41, col. 15, lines 60-63, and col. 27, lines 36-39). Applicant submits that this teaching of Weigel, as well as the rest of Weigel, does not teach or suggest *providing* at least a portion of the access-control logic to the interconnection system *in response to an attempted inter-node communication* involving the at least one service component. (Emphasis added).

Because Weigel does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 13, and 37-38, Weigel fails to anticipate claims 1, 13, and 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Further, claims 2-12, 14-21, 24, 26-28, 30-36 and 42-49 depend from either of claims 1, 13, 37, or 38, and thus are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

4.   Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-21, 24, 26-28, 30-38 and 42-49 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: December 19, 2005   By: _David L. Ciesielski_

David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001